





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/936,682	09/17/2001	Mark L Acosta		8905	
30903 75	590 01/28/2004	EXAM	EXAMINER		
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. CHASE TOWER, SUITE 1600 600 TRAVIS STREET			MCCARTNE	MCCARTNEY, LINZY T	
			ART UNIT	PARER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, TX 77002-2911			2671	13	
			DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Interview Summary	09/936,682	09/936,682 ACOSTA ET AL.			
,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Linzy McCartney	2671			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representativ	ve, PTO personnel):				
(1) <u>Linzy McCartney</u> .	(3) <u>Mark Zimmerman</u>				
(2) <u>William Jensen</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: 22 January 2004.					
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) If Yes, brief description:	Yes e)⊠ No.				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1, 12, 23, and 34</u> .					
Identification of prior art discussed: Cline, Yanof, C	<u> Dil &amp; Gas Journal, W0 00/14574</u> .				
Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was read	ched. g)⊠ was not reached. I	n)□ N/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation</u>		ed to if an agreement was			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, wh allowable is available, a summary thereof must be	ere no copy of the amendments				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST O INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a rep GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DA	oly to the last Office action has al	ready been filed, APPLICANT IS			

FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant questioned whether the Cline reference taught limiting imaging to datawords at only intersecting locations. The Examiner explained that he interpreted Cline to teach only imaing datawords at the intersection of plane with the 3D volume. Applicant questioned the motivation to combine the Oil & Gas Journal reference with the Cline and Yanof references. The Examiner explained in further detail the motivation cited in the Office Action. Applicant argued that the WO/0014574 failed to teach interpolating between said first spline curve and said second spline curve to define a three-dimensional surface representative of said physical phenoma. The Examiner explained his interpretation of the WO/0014574 reference and how it taught the aformentioned limitation. Applicant requested that the Examiner consider the IDS and the Examiner indicated to the Applicant that in his reply to the Applicant's response he would consider the IDS. Applicant also requested that some indication be made to ensure the correct set of claims would be issued if the case became allowable. The Examiner indicated that he would mark the erroroneous set of claims with "DO NOT ENTER" to ensure the correct set of claims would be published, if the case became allowable.